

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

JIKINTE MORRIS,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:14-26283

BART MASTERS, Warden,  
FCI-McDowell

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and recommendations ("PF&R") for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). See Doc. No. 2.

Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his PF&R on May 17, 2017, in which he recommended that the Court deny Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State or Federal Custody under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, see Doc. No. 1; and remove this matter from the docket of the court.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted seventeen days in which to file any objections to the Magistrate Judge's PF&R. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allotted constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court. See Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

The parties failed to file any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the seventeen-day period. Accordingly, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge PF&R as follows:

- 1) Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 by a Person in State or Federal Custody, see Doc. No. 1, is **DENIED**; and
- 2) The Clerk is directed to remove this matter from the docket of the court.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable.

See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683–84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and to Petitioner.

It is **SO ORDERED** this 9th day of June, 2017.

ENTER:

David A. Faber

David A. Faber  
Senior United States District Judge